REMARKS

The application has been amended. Claims 6-16 are pending, of which claims 6, 8, 10-14 and 16 have been amended as described herein. The specification has also been amended, and in accordance with the Examiner's request, such amendments are incorporated in to a substitute specification that is submitted herewith. A replacement sheet for Fig. 4 containing the legend "Prior Art" is also submitted herewith. The substitute specification and replacement Fig. 4 address the Examiner's concerns regarding the disclosure. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of these amendments and the remarks that follow.

Turning now to the claim rejections, claims 6-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement and being indefinite. The claims have been amended to address these concerns.

Claims 6-16 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on U.S. patent 5,157,782 to *Tuttle et al.* (*Tuttle*). *Tuttle* is directed to a hardware and software testing system. Input data for testing purposes is input into software modules residing on a host computer where such data is stored. The input data is simultaneously sent to a digital video signal processing unit (DVPU), which then sends the input data to the software application(s) residing on a system under test (SUT) computer. This causes a visual display device in communication with the SUT computer to generate visual display signals. In response to a user command, the DVPU captures the visual display signals and directs them to the software modules on the host computer where they are recorded. In response to a user command, the stored input data is sent, via the DVPU, to the software application(s) on the SUT, causing the visual display device to generate new visual display signals, which are captured by the DVPU. In this way, newly captured visual display signals can be compared to previously stored visual display signals. If they do not match, then the DVPU sends an error signal to the software modules on the host computer, indicating that the software application(s) or hardware of the SUT is not functioning properly.

Applicants' claimed invention is different. No SUT is needed. As recited in independent claim 6, which has been amended to emphasize the interaction between the evaluator and simulator components, automated evaluation of an application program is performed efficiently without the need for an interface or test system device. The evaluator reads event data for each input event and reference data for each corresponding reference output result. In response to an operating system command, the event data for each input event is transmitted to the simulator that simulates an operation of the application program based on that input event and outputs a corresponding simulation result. The data of the simulation result is then compared with the data of the corresponding reference result to determine whether the results are substantially the same. The process is repeated for each input event.

In applicants' claimed system, the application program to be evaluated by automated evaluation is the same as the application program that is to be actually implemented. Therefore, no automated evaluation system interface program IP is needed, thereby eliminating unnecessary functions that may introduce unstable factors and compromise the evaluation process. *Tuttle's* more involved testing process, which requires a host computer an interface device (DVPU) and an SUT, does not anticipate applicants' claimed arrangement.

Independent claim 16, which is directed to a method for evaluating an application program but is similar in scope to system claim 6, is believed to be patentably distinguishable over *Tuttle* for the same reasons as independent claim 6. It is further submitted that each of dependent claims 7-15 is patentable for at least the same reasons as its independent claim 6.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael T. Gabrik

Michael T. Gabrik
Registration No. 32,896

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
150 River Oaks Parkway, Suite 225
San Jose, CA 95134
Phone: (408) 952-6000
Facsimile: (408) 954-9058
Customer No. 20178

Date: October 29, 2004

AMENDMENTS TO DRAWINGS:

Fig. 4 has been amended as requested by the examiner to include the legend "Prior Art." Such amendment is included in the accompanying replacement sheet of Fig. 4.